

### **Market movements.**

There is great excitement now that the recession is receding. this means market confidence, of course. if the market is not going to go down, then there is opportunity - let me explain to you how.

If the first world is recovering from the recession, and the third world is still feeling the ripples of the recession, then it is a good time to invest in the third world. this is because a building is a building, an employee an employee, and, of course, a product a product.

Now, if they are desperate to sell, you could phone the owners or share holders directly. they often don't pay attention to their market listing, with lazy bankers ignoring those that don't do too well. you could make a score!

### **What i think about islam.**

Islam is very different to christianity, and it makes people distrust each other on each side of the ocean. the main reason that christians and such fear islam is because they turn to violence to get their way, yes? of course, this is because they have run out of patience at that point, and want to show people the right way.

The word moslem means "the one that submits." it is of course submission to allah. if they think something is not good, then they will say so. if they think something is really not god, they will do something about it. imagine america where there were people doing more than marching - same thing, yes?

I find the main difference is due to relay culture. if you ask either denomination what is good, they will agree what is good. if you ask either denomination what is bad, they will disagree, yes? this means, there is a clear line if they can agree what is good, but cannot agree what is bad, of course.

Now, if they say that abortion is bad, and progressives say it is bad, then they align themselves politically with the g.o.p, yes? nobody there has guns, so they must be progressives! nobody there does child porn, so they must be g.o.p! nobody there does drugs, they must be g.o.p! they do not allow women to do that much, they must be g.o.p!

Think about it, it is not that different if it comes down to it, they just take a conservative stance, yes?

So, we could also say that the culture is a lot like mexico, it is a lot like india with the peacefulness, and, it is a lot like ireland with the i.r.a. and the suicide bombers that have what they think is an important message, yes?

I particularly like 'the sand people' because of their image. it is one of honour and respect, even if they have never seen you before. it is one of charity, even if they owe you nothing. it is one of humility as a people and humble before god - fasting.

### **Land fills and other pollution.**

I find that land fills are a desperate cry for help, as they are just there to be filled by rubbish. we

need to organize something much better.

If we were to burn it, it would become  $\text{CO}_2$ . if we were to just leave it there, it would harm the soil.  
if we were to dump it into the sea, it would kill the fish.

This is why we need to 'dissolve' it. this can be done with acids that dissolve food and other biomass. as soon as that is gone, we are left with plastics, metals and wood, yes?

We can recycle these things.

### **Stem cell research.**

This reminds me of a much cheaper and slower version of nano bots that regrow things of the body. with nano bots, they are chemicals, and everything is made of chemicals, and these things can regrow the organs and other parts of the body quickly.

Of course, with there being more people all around the world on a stable basis, growing populations will see that rare diseases become less rare, and we will need a cheap alternative for medicine.

So, organ growing. this is a sound theory. we could take eggs out of the womb and grow just parts of them, or, we could observe the genes of the organ, 'cutting' the rest out of the genes, and then grow the organ. this will be easy and acceptable now if we do not harvest from whole living things, of course.

Or, we could split the gene pool to find 'like' genes, and collect them together from a person that is healthy. this would be similar to a blood donation. simply filtering out the rest of the 'genes' and making them collect at 'like minded' places, would see the genes, instead of leading to a healthy replica of the person, if stuck into an egg, they would collect all the heart genes to one area, and all the liver genes to another area. this will result in being able to grow just that organ, with no problem as to the harming of a living thing, yes?

Now, to collect them all to one area sounds easy, but it is actually easier! if we were to observe that the genes are kept separate by those 'stick things' in the blood or d.n.a, then we could see that we could 'mix' them. we could observe that each part of 'information' is related to another, and they will be drawn together if mixed, yes? this will mean, a lot of blood being 'mixed' could result in large clumps of 'heart mix' and 'liver mix.' this will see the organs 'mating' and keeping the gene pool fresh, yes?

So, in a large vat we could put all sorts of blood, and then, maybe a little uneconomically, we could harvest like one heart from a few litres of blood, along with one liver and kidney, among other things.

Getting the like genes to collect together would be easier if they were to tell the blood to 'grow' into organs. maybe simply making organs out of blood would work - we simply cannot have them growing babies to harvest from!

If we were to want to tell the blood to grow into organs, we could administer 'sperm' to it. an egg cell is a glob of blood, yes? what else could it be when it gets ejected from the body? so, if we were to administer or inject blood with sperm, it will fertilize the egg, but what will it do to the blood? we know you can get aids from oral sex, so, at least it mixes.

So, if we want to make the blood to start to 'grow an organ,' we need to, and this will take a long time, take the genes for that organ out of the blood, and put it inside a 'cytoplasm shell' where it will keep the sperm inside of it. this will let the sperm circulate in the blood, and hopefully mix with the genes and bring forth an organ or something?

To grow an organ we need the genes and d.n.a. only. we could take a drop of blood, and take the information from that drop, and then make those genes grow artificially with some growth hormones! this will see them swell up and become that thing they were supposed to be, while, the rest of the information just gets lost in the organ, yes?

Of course, to regrow limbs and stuff, we could grow them the same way as organs, then administer a few thousand nanobots, costing a few hundred dollars, to 'spark the life' between the blood vessels and nerves and nervous system, yes? this could be done for the organs too.

### **Material maker.**

I have rethought my ideas about sending the world into free fall, and, have thought too that it will make everything cheaper to make these 'machines.' think, now, there will be nearly unlimited amounts of these things, and, then things will get cheaper, yes? think of the oil price - it will drop, and, is always the instigator of 'inflation.'

Along with my 'anti inflation ideas,' or, 'deflation' to the fifties era of america, this will go down well. all we need is trees! there is a hell of a movement going on at the moment with planting trees, so, obviously the producers of these things will need to buy land with trees on them, yes? the trees will be far more than ever before, even prehistoric times, in 2020, as there are missionaries planting them all over the place.

Trees are 'the gateway' to oil and diamonds, of course. this means mines will close down, but, then there will be more of this to be middle men for, of course. with 'deflation' on everything except housing, we will see the impoverished people of the country being able to afford more, yes?

What will really happen to the miners though? it is far harder to mine than it is to simply stick things through a machine, yes? why, they will operate the machines, and store the goods, maybe for less pay, but there will be a bigger industry behind them, supporting them, of course.

Now, i want to concentrate on other essential materials, like iron ore. iron does not come from coal, it comes from 'rocks.' simply ageing the rocks by speeding up the orbital movements around them in the electron cloud will see them become something useful too. actually, this will work with anything, i hope.

Speeding up the orbital movements could be done by electrifying them, as i have already said. of course, the more power we put through them, the quicker they will age, yes? let's see the mechanism to speed them up?

Orbital movements have not been covered by science, as we are more interested in the basics of them, not knowing what to use them for yet. this was science, now it is purely academics - we want them to spin faster, yes? i say this will age them faster,

as, by way of a 'atomic reaction' everything ages the more it spins, that is why there are things like half lives, yes? of course, the more you use a wire, the older and dirtier it gets, think of that, yes?

We can make them spin faster by splitting the nucleus, letting the energy held within out - hey, it might instantly make it age to 'the end?' of course, if this is too much, then cutting off smaller sections might be what we are looking for, with, of course, a minute laser? maybe a nano laser, that is set on a belting system to mass produce this 'stuff?'

or, of course, to speed up the orbitals movements around the 'core,' we could add orbitals by simply bombarding it with electricity charges, or,

We might be able to add nucleuses, which would actually make it go slower, as they will be away from the nucleus energy - no wait - that is protons that absorb them, and positrons or something that push them - i know something pushes them!

I suppose adding nucleuses, as that is the centre and the draw card for the electron, will make it come in closer to the 'core' meaning their trip will be shorter around in their orbit, as they will be closer. this might disfigure the material though, no worries, if it is oil, but, if it is diamonds or something that needs to be 'hard,' or solid, then we might want to compact them?

### **Making food quickly.**

What could be nicer than growing food with this technique and then simply taking out the seeds to do it all over again with? that would be great, yes?

To do this, we need to observe that food made like that would probably taste very bad, of course. there might be some biological way to grow food quickly that would see the food still taste nice.

Maybe if we were to observe that growth hormones and fuels for the plants could result in 'great yields,' and still keep them quite tasty, we might have a winner? if we were to administer new growth hormones that make food grow so we can see it growing with our very eyes, we could do the same for pancreases in diabetes and so forth too. let's call this bio-grow?

Basically, we would need growth hormones that act as a 'disease.' that is, they will spiral out of control and grow like a 'tumour,' just very quickly. this leads to the idea that we could make the food age, as, that is what cancer does, yes?

Of course, if we were to activate 'cancer cells' in all types of biomass then we could see it grow quickly. maybe if we were to observe pimples, and, maybe hair growth, therein might lay more secrets?

### **'Growth ray.'**

I was just watching "honey i shrunk the kids," and i thought it would be cool if i could patent something that people think will make them grow, of course. i don't care if it only works a little bit, or even not at all - i want cold hard cash! No, man, seriously, this would just be another feather in my cap, the way i see it.

So, we have something we need to make bigger, and we need something to make it bigger, yes? if we were to want to enlarge 'something,' be it a lump of gold, a person or a fresh fruit to eat, we need to observe that it is made out of 'mass,' yes? let us first try it with 'dead things?' i think there might be something unhealthy about it in living things, so we will start with dead things, then adjust, okay?

If we want to make a diamond bigger, we must observe that it is matter, as all things we touch and then use would stay matter, yes? if we were to observe that in living things i have already adjusted to cell proliferation - but i cannot remember how, of course - we will need to create 'mass' out of 'air.' alternatively, and probably infinitely easier, would be to make matter out of water, but let's try with air first, as we have more of that.

Maybe if we were to try to make the matter 'denser,' by making the air 'contract,' we could bring more orbitals into the area, or, 'cluster them closer.' under my superior nazi science, density is shown by the number of orbitals around and on it. this means, of course, that if we were to observe the mechanism that draws electrons together, we would need to place another nucleus there inside the thing we want to 'grow' or make 'denser,' as this will bring more orbital electrons towards it, making it 'denser.' this would lead from air, to liquid, to solid - hell, maybe we can even make water out of air? works for nature!

So, we need to bring more orbitals into the "electron cloud" by electrifying 'the thing.' this will make water evaporate, so it actually makes it worse! so, we need to reverse electrify the matter or air. this is getting complicated!

Maybe we could observe that cooling makes air more 'solid?' observe, if you will, the effects of cold over grass lands in winter when there is a mist? this obviously means that the air is growing in density, so;

If we want to cool air down, it will turn to ice, but, then it is matter. then we bombard it with 'magnetism,' to attract orbitals with it being 'unstable' - remember, a fire or flame is excited orbitals trying to regain balance. this magnetism can attract lots of particles to the ice - hey, wait a moment, if we were just to ignore the cooling of the air, and use magnetism instead, we could attract particles with the magnetism, or, hell protons or something, and then see the matter grow - what do i know? the problem will be what will it grow into?

Of course, if you were to have a chemical identifier, and, all materials on earth are made of chemicals on the "elemental table," we would have a great selection of air molecules, and, of course, liquids then after that to make, and, then solids. as soon as we have any matter, we can make it denser to become what we want it to become.

Now, the biomass of people, plants and animals will be affected through magnetism, and, not be exposed to unhealthy electrical things from the previous ideas. hell, once we know what we are looking for it will be easy to replicate.

### **3D printing and micro particles.**

With the recent advances in 3D printing, people are looking for even smaller ways to manipulate microparticles and make things out of them;



Originally Posted by <http://www.technovelgy.com/ct/Science-Fiction-News.asp?NewsNum=4691>

*The authors suggest that producing 3-D shapes at the micro scale could be useful for designing custom biomaterials such as interlocking particles that self-assemble to help tissue regenerate, or for industrial applications such as creating new coatings and paints with unique light-reactive properties. "We know that shape often determines material function, so while we have a few ideas of what this could lead to, this fundamental capability to produce made-to-order 3-D microparticles could be applied in ways we have not contemplated," said Dino Di Carlo, the principal investigator on the research and a professor of bioengineering at UCLA. "There are so many potential applications — in that sense, it's really exciting."*

*To make smaller custom objects with folds, holes and other precise features, the UCLA team developed a new technique called optical transient liquid modeling. It uses a series of microfluidic and optical technologies, including a technique previously developed by Di Carlo's research group that simplifies designing the shape of fluid flows.*

Of course, getting to the micro particles requires us to observe at the micro level. if we want to manipulate things smaller than particles, i think maybe we should start at atoms, yes? this means we can control the chemicals to do things, then the particles, then the microparticles will follow suite, obviously, as the relay from the big thing to the smaller things will be natural.

Maybe splitting the photons, electrons and other particles will result in more microparticles? let us learn some more;



Originally Posted by <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Microparticle>

**Microparticles** are particles between 0.1 and 100  $\mu\text{m}$  in size. Commercially available microparticles are available in a wide variety of materials, including *ceramics, glass, polymers, and metals*. Microparticles encountered in daily life include *pollen, sand, dust, flour, and powdered sugar*. Microparticles have a much larger surface-to-volume ratio than at the macroscale, and thus their behavior can be quite different. For example, metal microparticles can be explosive in air.

*Microspheres* are spherical microparticles, and are used where consistent and predictable particle surface area is important. In biological systems, microparticles are small membrane bound vesicles circulating in the blood derived from cells that are in contact with the bloodstream such as platelets and endothelial cells (see *endothelial microparticle*). Because they retain the signature membrane protein composition of the parent cell, microparticles carry useful information and can be detected and characterized by *flow cytometry*.

Working with these small things means that we need to control them, of course. controlling them will be easier if we were to create 'micro tools' and 'clusters.' this could be done by observing that the fastest way to get a 'readout' and analyse them would be to get a whole lot of electrons, protons and other particles together and split them in certain sequences, yes? this would mean we would be mixing them, in a semi random way, by combining them together in tiny containers. then we could also heat and freeze them, seeing what happens to them then, yes?

Maybe if we were to observe that starting with the biomass ones will lead to a liquid that can mix, we could mix all the microparticles into several experiments and then see what they do when exposed to reactive environments and influences.

But, let me hazard some guesses? if we were to split the electron, we would probably be like lighting a fuse, with all the electron bits splitting into more electrons, yes? this would be because they are negatively charged, and, will become more charged having a smaller area for their own orbitals to travel. this could result in super power! or, it could result in a shorter lifespan, and, super power! i am sure about the life span though, it is like cracking open an egg - you know it will give off yolk, and you can divide the yolk, but it is together for a reason, yes? this reason is that it is 'stable,' as everything in nature looks to be stable, of course. if you were to have something unstable, it will try to re-stabilise itself as soon as possible, as we look to do when we trip, yes?

Of course, if we were to compare these universal laws with like laws, splitting the photon will result in smaller stronger more radio active photons, as a diamond will get 'more wild' and do it's shining all over the place. photons i don't think have a charge for output, but rather just travel their atomic mass away, as they have mass, otherwise they will not move, as nothing without mass can move, yes? so, it will be maybe impossible to split something without mass.

To control the microparticles we know are out there, we need to fashion tools out of electrons and protons, as, they stabilize each other. this means, if we were to connect them together, and cut them away from the nucleus and other particles, we could have a continuous interaction between the two, as, they stabilize each other.

Then, with more positive charge than negative charge, we could build a tool out of them that we could actually leave the electron out of, as protons are stable as they have a positive spin, and, we know that that is all that is required to 'survive.'

Splitting protons will result in more 'dead weight' as it has a positive spin, unlike the things it neutralizes and keeps in check.

Without the nucleus and negative particles, the proton will be free to work by itself, or,

We could fold protons to work together, making little tools out of them? we could join them by adding central negative particles.

Maybe they could shape the whole 'atom' by making it full of particles? this would see the cluster so heavy the electrons will be going through the protons the whole time, brining it together so it can be 'solid,' or,

Maybe we could bring the atoms so close together there will be no place for the protons to go, and, then we can find the drawing force from the atom to bring the protons into a 'shape?'

Notes on the 'teleporter.'

Maybe if we were to combine vectors and the fourth dimension, we could open holes to anywhere nearby? we could link the areas with vectors, like with a vector modem, and then open a huge hole between those points. the problem is that it will suck everything up that is in between the two points!

So, we need to use it from port city to port city. we could put up makeshift oil rigs along the way so it can be transported across huge sea ways, of course?